

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT
(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

REC'D 03 MAR 2006

WIPO

PCT

Applicant's or agent's file reference P18511-TPF	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/PEAA16)	
International application No. PCT/EP 03/14799	International filing date (day/month/year) 23.12.2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 23.12.2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F1/00		
Applicant TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON (PUBL) et al.		
<p>1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).</p> <p>These annexes consist of a total of sheets.</p>		
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <p>I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the opinion</p> <p>II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority</p> <p>III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</p> <p>IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention</p> <p>V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</p> <p>VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited</p> <p>VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application</p> <p>VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application</p>		
Date of submission of the demand 12.07.2005	Date of completion of this report 02.03.2006	
Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:  European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Authorized Officer Mäenpää, J Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7287 	

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No. PCT/EP 03/14799

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)*):

Description, Pages

1-25 as originally filed

Claims, Numbers

1-18 as originally filed

Drawings, Sheets

1/7-7/7 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
 - ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
 - ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:
- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
 - ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
 - ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.
4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
- ☐ the description, pages:
 - ☐ the claims, Nos.:
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets:

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No. **PCT/EP 03/14799**

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	5,6,11,12,17,18
	No: Claims	1-4,7-10,13-16
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-18
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-18
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: JAJODIA S ET AL: "Flexible support for multiple access control policies" ACM TRANSACTIONS ON DATABASE SYSTEMS ACM USA, vol. 26, no. 2, June 2001 (2001-06), pages 214-260, XP002301060 ISSN: 0362-5915

2 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 7 and 13 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

The document D1 discloses according to the features of claim 1 (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

- method for taking a policy decision by a policy decision device (chapter 4.1, figure 7, "Authorization framework")
- wherein the policy decision device has access to objects being relatable to each other by relations of one or more relation types (page 222, Definitions 3.1, 3.2 Authorisation Subject/Object Hierarchy; page 224, example 3.1; figure 5, authorisation subject hierarchy)

(Example 3.1 in D1 given for a subject hierarchy is valid as such for an object hierarchy as well, see page 223, last sentence, page 226, lines 25-37, "... the system security officer may specify different propagation policies for each of the hierarchies ..." . Therefore the further citations corresponding to the object hierarchy of claim 1 are given referring to the subject hierarchy example 3.1 of D1. This correspondence is directly and unambiguously derivable from D1.)

- receiving a request for the policy decision, the request specifying a first object of the objects and request information (figure 7: triple "(o,s,+a)" corresponding to object, subject, action; page 229, lines 3-26, "...every request is seen as coming from either a user or a role ...")

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET**

International application No. PCT/EP 03/14799

- obtaining a policy matching to the request information and being applicable to a second object of the objects (example 3.1, authorisation for the subject G2 "o,G2,-a"; figure 7, "authorisation table"; chapter 4.1, "authorisation table")
- obtaining at least one propagation rule associated to the policy (pages 224-226, "We are now ready to describe various different authorization propagation policies ... Path overrides ... Authorisations of a node are propagated to its subnodes if not overridden ... ")
- the at least one propagation rule specifying at least one relation type of the one or more relation types (page 226, lines 5-17, "Path overrides ... Authorisations of a node are propagated to its subnodes ...")
- verifying if a relation path exists, the relation path linking the first object and the second object and consisting of one or more of the relations, verifying if the one or more relations of the relation path are in accordance with at least one of the at least one specified relation type (page 226, lines 5-17, "Path overrides ... Authorisations of a node are propagated to its subnodes ..."; figure 6.d, subject G5)
- if said relation path exists and if said one or more relations of the relation path are in accordance, applying the policy to the first object for taking the policy decision (chapter 3.4, "Example decision policies", figure 6.d, derived authorisation for the subject G5 "o,G5,-a"), figure 7, "granted/denied")

The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 7 and 13 which therefore are also considered not new.

- 3 Dependent claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step in view of the documents and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.